

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 remain in the application. Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated May 21, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,226,057 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,088 to Hanazawa (hereinafter "Hanazawa"). Claims 3-6, 9-11, 15-18, and 20-22 are rejected over Lee in view of Hanazawa as applied to claims 1 and 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,444 to Takemura (hereinafter "Takemura"). Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowability of claims 2, 7, 8, 13, and 19 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. The rejections of these claims is traversed and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example "a first pixel electrode disposed in the first pixel region, the first pixel electrode overlapping only one of the first and the second regions of the first data line, and the pixel electrode overlapping only one of the first and second regions of the second data line; a second pixel electrode disposed in second pixel region, the second pixel electrode overlapping only one of the first and second regions of the second data line that is not overlapped by the first pixel electrode." None of the cited references including Lee or Hanazawa, singly or in combination, teaches or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-11, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 12 is allowable over the cited art in that claim 12 recites a combination of elements including, for example “forming a first pixel electrode in the first pixel region to overlap only one of the first and the second regions of the first data line and to overlap only one of the first and second regions of the second data line; and forming a second pixel electrode in the second pixel region to overlap only one of the first and the second regions of the second data line that is not overlapped by the first pixel electrode.” None of the cited references including Lee or Hanazawa et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 12 and claims 13-22, which depend therefrom are also allowable over the cited references.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the references when combined. See M.P.E.P. § 2413. Applicant respectfully submits a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. For example, Hanazawa and Lee both show adjacent pixel electrodes overlapping the same data line region. (In Hanazawa specifically note in FIG. 3 the region of the data line 50a(X) where the labels 54(PE) and 51(PE) show both of the adjacent pixel electrodes overlapping the data line.) This is contrary to claim 1 wherein: “the first pixel electrode overlap[s] only one of the first and the second regions of the first data line” and “the second pixel electrode overlap[s] only one of the first and second regions of the second data line that is not overlapped by the first pixel electrode.” Therefore, neither Lee or Hanazawa have at least these features of claim 1, and Applicant respectfully submits a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the aforementioned combination of claim elements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-11, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 12 is also allowable over Lee and Hanazawa. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 and claims

13-22, which depend from claim 12, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By *Eric J. Nuss*
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No.: 40,106
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant

